arXiv:1611.06343v1 [cs.DC] 19 Nov 2016

Gossiping with Latencies

Seth Gilbert * Peter Robinson † Suman Sourav ‡

Abstract

Consider the classical problem of information dissemination: one (or more) nodes in a network have some information that they want to distribute to the remainder of the network. In this paper, we study the cost of information dissemination in networks where edges have latencies, i.e., sending a message from one node to another takes some amount of time. We first generalize the idea of conductance to weighted graphs, defining ϕ_* to be the "weighted conductance" and ℓ_* to be the "critical latency." One goal of this paper is to argue that ϕ_* characterizes the connectivity of a weighted graph with latencies in much the same way that conductance characterizes the connectivity of unweighted graphs.

We give near tight upper and lower bounds on the problem of information dissemination, up to polylogarithmic factors. Specifically, we show that in a graph with (weighted) diameter D (with latencies as weights), maximum degree Δ, weighted conductance ϕ_* and critical latency ℓ_*, any information dissemination algorithm requires at least $\Omega(\min(D+\Delta, \ell_*/\phi_*))$ time. We show several variants of the lower bound (e.g., for graphs with small diameter, graphs with small max-degree, etc.) by reduction to a simple combinatorial game.

We then give nearly matching algorithms, showing that information dissemination can be solved in $O(\min((D+\Delta)\log^3 n), (\ell_*/\phi_*)\log(n))$ time. This is achieved by combining two cases. When nodes do not know the latency of the adjacent edges, we show that the classical push-pull algorithm is (near) optimal when the diameter or maximum degree is large. For the case where the diameter and maximum degree are small, we give an alternative strategy in which we first discover the latencies and then use an algorithm for known latencies based on a weighted spanner construction. (Our algorithms are within polylogarithmic factors of being tight both for known and unknown latencies.)

*School of Computing, National University of Singapore, Email: seth.gilbert@comp.nus.edu.sg
†Royal Holloway, University of London, Email: peter.robinson@rhul.ac.uk
‡School of Computing, National University of Singapore, Email: sourav@comp.nus.edu.sg

1 Introduction

Consider the problem of disseminating information in a large-scale distributed system: nodes in the network have information that they want to share/aggregate/reconcile with others. Classic examples include distributed database replication, sensor network data aggregation, and peer to peer publish-subscribe systems. This fundamental problem has been widely studied under various names, e.g., information dissemination (e.g., [1]), rumor spreading (e.g., [2]), global broadcast (e.g., [3]), one-to-all multicast, and information spreading (e.g., [4]).

Model. We model the network as a connected, undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with $n = |V|$ nodes. Each node knows the identities of its neighbors and a polynomial upper bound on the size of the network. Nodes communicate bidirectionally over the graph edges, and communication proceeds in synchronous rounds. An edge is said to be activated whenever a node sends any message over the edge.

Each edge has a *latency* that captures how long communication takes, i.e., how many rounds it takes for two neighbors to exchange information. (Latencies occur in the communication channel and not on the nodes.) For simplicity, we assume that each edge latency is an integer. (If not, latencies can be scaled and rounded to the nearest integer.) Let D be the (weighted) diameter of the graph (with latencies as weights), and let $\ell_{\max}$ be the maximum edge latency. We consider both cases where nodes know the latency of adjacent edges (Section 5) and cases where nodes do not know the latencies of adjacent edges (the rest of the paper). Nodes do not know D or $\ell_{\max}$.[1]

In each round, each node can choose one neighbor to exchange information with: it sends a message to that neighbor and (automatically) receives a response. If the edge has latency ℓ, then this round-trip exchange takes time ℓ.[2] Notice that each node can initiate a new exchange in every round, even if previous messages have not yet been delivered, i.e., communication is non-blocking.

Information dissemination. We focus in this paper on *one-to-all information dissemination*. A designated source node begins with a message (the *rumor*) and, when the protocol completes, every node should have received the message. As a building block, we look at *local broadcast*, i.e., the problem of every node distributing a message to all of its neighbors.We say that a protocol has ϵ-error if it succeeds with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

Results. Our goal in this paper is to determine how long it takes to disseminate information in a graph with latencies. Clearly the running time will depend on the (weighted) diameter D of the graph (with latencies as weights). Typically, such algorithms also depend on how well connected the graph is, and this is normally captured by the conductance ϕ. Unfortunately, conductance is no longer a good indicator of connectivity in a graph with latencies, as slow edges (with large weights) are much worse than fast edges.[3]

We begin by generalizing the idea of conductance, defining ϕ_* to be the weighted conductance of a graph with latencies (see Definition 2). At the same time, we define the critical latency of a graph ℓ_*, which specifies the latency at which the graph is connected with the desired conductance. A key goal of this paper is to argue that weighted conductance is a good way to capture the connectivity

[1] In real world settings, nodes are often aware of their neighbors. However, due to fluctuations in network quality (and hence latency), a node cannot necessarily predict the latency of a connection.

[2] Notice that this model of communication is essentially equivalent to the traditional *push-pull* where each node can either push data to a neighbor or pull data from a neighbor; here we assume a node always does both simultaneously. Without the ability to pull data, it is easy to see that information exchange takes $\Omega(nD)$ time, e.g., in a star. Simple flooding matches this lower bound.

[3] Notice you might model an edge with weight w as a path of w edges with weight 1. If you calculate the conductance of the resulting graph, you do not get a good characterization of the connectivity of the original graph for a few different reasons. For example, consider the ability of the imaginary nodes on the edge to pull data from the endpoints.

of weighted graphs with latencies.

We then show nearly tight upper and lower bounds on the time to disseminate information, within poly-logarithmic factors. We show that for graph G, with diameter D, maximum degree Δ, weighted conductance ϕ_*, and critical latency ℓ_*, any information dissemination algorithms requires $\Omega(\min(D+\Delta, \ell_*/\phi_*))$ rounds. That is, in the worst case it may certainly take time $D+\Delta$ to distribute information. However, if the graph is well connected, then we may do better—and the time is characterized by the weighted conductance. We show that this lower bound holds in several cases, e.g., for graphs with small diameter, for graphs with small max-degree, etc.

The key technique we use is a reduction to a simpler combinatorial guessing game. (See [5] for a demonstration of how similar guessing games can be used to prove lower bounds for radio networks.) We first show that the guessing game itself takes a large number of rounds. Thereafter we reduce the problem of solving the guessing game to that of solving information dissemination via a simulation.

We then show nearly matching upper bounds, i.e., algorithms for solving information dissemination. In this regard, we differentiate our model into two cases. For the case where nodes are not aware of the adjacent edge latencies, we show that the classical push-pull random phone call algorithm [6] in which each node initiates a connection with a randomly chosen neighbor in each round, completes in time $O((\ell_*/\phi_*)\log(n))$.

For the case where nodes know the latencies of the incident edges we obtain nearly tight bounds that are independent of Δ and ϕ_*: we give a $O(D\log^3 n)$-time algorithm (which is within polylogarithmic factors of the trivial $\Omega(D)$ lower bound). The key idea of the algorithm is to build a (weighted) spanner (similar to that in [7]). This spanner is then used to distribute the information. This algorithm requires knowledge of a polynomial upper bound on n; hence for completeness we also provide an alternate algorithm in Appendix E that takes $O(D\log^2 n \log D)$ time but does not require the knowledge of an upper bound on network size.

Finally, we observe that we can always discover the latencies of the "important" adjacent edges in $\tilde{O}(D+\Delta)$ time[4], after which we can use the algorithm which requires known latencies. Hence, even if latencies are unknown, combining the various algorithms, we can always solve the information dissemination in $O(\min((D+\Delta)\log^3 n), (\ell_*/\phi_*)\log(n))$ time, matching the lower bounds (up to polylogarithmic factors).

Prior work. There is a long history studying the time and message complexity of disseminating information *when all the links have the same latency*, i.e., when the graph is unweighted. It is interesting to contrast what can be achieved in the weighted case with what can be achieved in the unweighted case.

For any kind of global computation, in a distributed setting, nodes need to share information among one another. The classic model for studying information dissemination is the *random phone call model*, introduced by [8]: in each round, each node communicates with a single randomly selected neighbor; if it knows the rumor, then it "pushes" the information to its neighbor; if it does not know the rumor, then it "pulls" it from its neighbor (see, e.g., [9], [10], [11]).

An important special case is when the graph is a clique: any pair of nodes can communicate directly. In a seminal paper, Karp et al. [6] show that a rumor can be disseminated in a complete graph in $O(\log n)$ rounds with $O(n\log\log n)$ message complexity. Fraigniaud and Giakkoupis [12] show how to simultaneously achieve optimal communication complexity (except for extremely small rumor sizes).

When the graph is not a clique, the performance of the classical push-pull protocol, wherein a node exchanges information with a random neighbor in each round, typically depends on the graph

[4]Note that $\tilde{O}$ here refers to addition polylog factors that arise when you need to estimate D and Δ, if they are unknown.

conductance. An exciting sequence of papers (see [2, 11, 13, 14] and references therein) eventually showed that rumor spreading in this manner takes time $O(\frac{\log n}{\phi})$, where ϕ is the conductance of the graph G.

The question that remained open was whether a more careful choice of neighbors lead to faster information dissemination. In a breakthrough result, Censor-Hillel et al. [1] gave a randomized algorithm for solving information dissemination in any (unweighted) graph in time $O(D_{hop}+\mathsf{polylog}n)$, where D_{hop} is the diameter of the graph. Of note, the protocol has no dependence on the conductance of the graph but only on the diameter (which is unavoidable). There were two key ingredients to their solution: first, they gave a "local broadcast" protocol where each node exchanges information with *all* its neighbors in $O(\log^3 n)$ time; second, they used this protocol to build a *spanner* efficiently connecting all the nodes in the graph. Haeupler [3] then showed how local broadcast could be achieved in $O(\log^2 n)$ time using a simple deterministic algorithm.

The conclusion, then, is that in an unweighted graph (with unit latency edges), information dissemination can be achieved in time $O(\min(D + \mathsf{polylog}n)$ or in time $O(\log n/\phi))$.

Other related works. The problem has been well researched in several other settings as well. For graphs modeling social networks Doerr et al. [15, 16] show a $\Theta(\log n)$ time bound for solving broadcast. For the case of direct addressing where nodes can directly contact other nodes of known identity (e.g., by IP address), Haeupler and Malkhi [17] show that broadcast can be performed optimally in $O(\log \log n)$ rounds (for a message of size $b = \Omega(\log n)$ while requiring total communication of $O(nb)$ bits). Information dissemination in random geometric graphs has been studied by Bradonjić et al. [18], in wireless sensor networks and adhoc networks by Boyd et al. [19], Sarwate and Dimakis [20] and Gandhi et al. [21], Georgiou et al. [22] study the problem in an asynchronous setting.

2 Weighted Conductance

We now define the weighted conductance of a graph, generalizing the classical notion of conductance. For a given graph $G = (V, E)$, and for a set of edges $S \subseteq E$, we define $E_\ell(S)$ to be the subset of edges of S that have latency $\leqslant \ell$. For a set of nodes $U \subseteq V$, we define $E_\ell(U, V \setminus U)$ to be the subset of edges across the cut $(U, V \setminus U)$ with latency $\leqslant \ell$. For a set of nodes $U \subseteq V$, we define the volume $\mathsf{Vol}(U)$ as the number of edges adjacent to nodes in U, i.e., $\mathsf{Vol}(U) = |\{(u, v) \mid u \in U \text{and } v \in V\}|$.

We first define the weighted conductance of a cut for a given latency ℓ, and then define the weight-ℓ conductance as the minimum weighted conductance across all cuts.

Definition 1 (Weight-ℓ Conductance)**.** *Consider a graph $G = (V, E)$. For any subset of nodes $U \subseteq V$ and integer ℓ, we define*

$$\phi_\ell(U) = \frac{|E_\ell(U, V \setminus U)|}{\min\{\mathsf{Vol}(U), \mathsf{Vol}(V \setminus U)\}} \ .$$

The weight-ℓ conductance *is given by $\phi_\ell(G) = \min_{U \subseteq V} \phi_\ell(U)$.*

Thus, for a weighted graph G, we have the set $\Phi(G) = \{\phi_1(G), \ldots, \phi_{\ell_{\max}}(G)\}$. We can now define the weighted conductance of the graph:

Definition 2 (Weighted Conductance)**.** *We define the* weighted conductance $\phi_*(G)$ *as*

$$\phi_*(G) = \arg\max_{\phi_\ell \in \Phi} \frac{\phi_\ell(G)}{\ell} \ . \tag{1}$$

We call ℓ_* the critical latency *for G if $\ell_* = \ell$ and $\phi_*(G) = \phi_\ell$.*

We simply write ϕ_* instead of $\phi_*(G)$ when graph G is clear from the context. If all edges have latency 1, then ϕ_* is exactly equal to the classical graph conductance [23].

3 Lower Bounds

We proceed to lower bound the time for completing information dissemination. The main goal of this section (as found in Theorems 6, 7, and 8) is to show that every gossip algorithm requires time $\Omega\Big(\min\Big\{\Delta + \mathsf{D}, \frac{\ell_*}{\phi_*}\Big\}\Big)$ on graphs with diameter D, degree Δ, weighted conductance ϕ_*, and critical latency ℓ_*.

Throughout this section, we assume that nodes do not know the latencies of their adjacent links. (When nodes do know the latencies, the trivial lower bound of $\Omega(D)$ is sufficient.)

We begin by defining a combinatorial guessing game (much as in [5]) and show a lower bound for it.[5] We then construct several different worst-case graphs and reduce the guessing game to solving information dissemination on these graphs, thereby showing our lower bound.

3.1 The Guessing Game

We define a guessing game played by Alice against an oracle. Conceptually, the game is played on a bipartite graph with $2m$ nodes. The oracle selects a subset of the edges as the target. In each round, Alice guesses a set of at most $2m$ edges, and the oracle reveals any target edges that have been hit. At the same time, if any edge (u, v) in the target set is guessed by Alice, then all adjacent edges (x, v) in the target set are removed from the target set.

Fix an integer m. Let A and B be two disjoint sets of m integers, i.e., the left and right nodes in the bipartite graph. The winning condition of the game depends on a predicate P, which returns a subset of edges from $A \times B$. For example, $P = \mathsf{Random}_p$ returns a subset T that contains elements of $A \times B$, where each element is chosen with probability p or discarded with probability $1 - p$. For a set $S \subseteq A \times B$, we use S^A and S^B to denote the projection of S onto the first and second coordinates respectively.

We now define the game $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$, which begins when Alice receives two disjoint sets A and B. The oracle chooses a *target set* $T_1 \subseteq A \times B$ returned by the predicate. Throughout, we assume that Alice has access to a public source of random bits.

Alice's goal is to eliminate all the elements in the target set. In each round $r \geqslant 1$, Alice submits a set $X_r \subseteq A \times B$ of size at most $2m$ as her *round r guesses* to the oracle. The oracle replies by revealing the items she guessed correctly, i.e., $X_r \cap T_r$. The oracle then computes the *round $r + 1$ target set* by removing the items that Alice hit, i.e., all the items in T_r that have the same B-component as an item in $X_r \cap T_r$:

$$T_{r+1} = T_r \setminus \Big(T_r^A \times \Big(T_r^B \cap X_r^B\Big)\Big). \tag{2}$$

This concludes round r and the next round begins.

The game is solved in a round r' if r' is the first round where Alice's guesses result in an empty target set; at this point, the oracle answers `halt`. In other words, the game ends in round r' if, for every $b \in T_1^B$, there was some $a' \in A$ such that $(a', b) \in X_r \cap T_r$, in some $r \in [1, r']$.

[5] The results of [5] do not apply directly to our setting, as the "proposal set" of the player must intersect the target set in exactly 1 element. By contrast, the guessing game here requires us to discover sufficiently many target elements such that every element in the target set occurs at least once.

The goal for Alice is to minimize the number of rounds until the target set becomes empty. We say that a *protocol* Π *solves* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$ *with probability* $1-\epsilon$ *in* r *rounds*, if Π always terminates within r rounds, and $T_{r+1} = \emptyset$ with probability $\geqslant 1-\epsilon$, for any target set T. In this case, we call Π an ϵ*-error protocol*.

3.2 Guessing by Gossiping

Our lower bound results use variants of an n-node distributed network that has a *guessing game gadget* of $2m$ nodes as a subgraph. As we will see below, the execution of a gossip algorithm on the n-node network can be simulated by Alice when playing the guessing game $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$, where $n \geqslant 2m$. In our gadget construction, we use predicate P, to specify a set of hidden small latency edges, which we call *fast edges*.

We use the notation $\mathsf{id}(v)$ to denote the ID of a vertex v, which, by construction is unique. Alice creates a set of nodes $L = \{v_1, \ldots, v_m\}$ where $\mathsf{id}(v_i) = a_i \in A$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and, similarly, maps the integers in B to the IDs of the vertex set $R = \{u_1, \ldots, u_m\}$ in a one-to-one fashion. Next, Alice creates a complete bipartite graph on sets L and R by adding m^2 *cross edges* and adds a clique on the vertices in L where all clique edges are considered to have latency 1.

We will construct the network in a way such that only some cross edges in the target set are useful to the algorithm by giving them small latencies whereas all other cross edges are assigned latency n. Formally, the latencies of a cross edge $e = (v_i, u_j)$ is 1 if $(\mathsf{id}(v_i), \mathsf{id}(u_j)) \in T$; otherwise e has latency n. We denote this constructed gadget as $G(P)$ and we also consider a symmetric variant, called $G^{\text{sym}}(P)$, where Alice creates a clique on R in addition to the one on L. See Figure 1.

Since Alice does not know the target set T in advance, she also does not know when a cross edge should have latency 1 or latency n. Nevertheless, these latency assignments are fixed a priori by the target set which is chosen by the oracle according to the predicate. Whenever a cross edge e is activated in our simulation, Alice submits the ID pair of the vertices of e as a guess to the oracle, whose answer reveals the target set membership and hence also the latency of e.

Lemma 3 (Gossip Protocol Simulation)**.** *Suppose that there is a* t*-round* ϵ*-error algorithm* $\mathcal{A}$ *that solves local broadcast on a given* $2m$*-node network* $G(P)$ *or* $G^{sym}(P)$*, for a predicate* P*. Then there is an* ϵ*-error protocol* Π *for* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$ *that terminates in* $\leqslant t$ *rounds.*

Proof. We argue that Alice can correctly simulate the execution of $\mathcal{A}$ on network $G(P)$ (and, similarly, on $G^{\text{sym}}(P)$) until the gossip algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ terminates or the oracle answers `halt`. At the same time, Alice can use the behavior of $\mathcal{A}$ on the graph $G(P)$ (and, similarly, on $G^{\text{sym}}(P)$) to derive a protocol for $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$.

If a clique edge (v_i, v_j) is activated by the algorithm, Alice locally simulates the bidirectional message exchange by updating the state of nodes v_i and v_j accordingly. In each round r of the gossip algorithm, a set of at most $2m$ cross edges is activated by the vertices simulated by Alice's. For each activated cross edge (v_i, u_j), Alice uses $(\mathsf{id}(v_i), \mathsf{id}(u_j))$ as one of her round r guesses. Consider some round $r \geqslant 1$, and suppose the oracle returns the empty set. For each one of Alice's submitted round r guess (a_i, b_j) that was not contained in the oracle's answer, Alice sets the latency of (a_i, b_j) to n by updating the local state of a_i. Here $a_i = \mathsf{id}(v_i)$ and $b_j = \mathsf{id}(u_j)$ that are chosen in round r, for some $v_i \in L$ and $u_j \in R$. It follows by a simple inductive argument that the state of every vertex in the simulation is equivalent to executing the algorithm on the network.

We now argue that the above simulation of a t-round gossip algorithm for local broadcast solves the game $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, P)$ in at most t rounds with probability $\geqslant 1-\epsilon$, for any predicate P. Recall that the guessing game ends if T becomes empty, which happens when Alice's correct guesses have

included every $b \in T^B$ at least once. Since every such b is a neighbor of a node in A, the only way it can receive a local broadcast message is via a fast cross-edge in T. Hence if the local broadcast algorithm terminates, we know that b was hit by one of Alice's guesses. □

3.3 Guessing Game Lower Bounds

The following lemma is instrumental for showing the $\Omega(\Delta)$ lower bound of Theorem 6, which holds when there are no other assumptions on the weighted conductance of the graph. Its proof uses basic facts from probability theory and is postponed to the appendix.

Lemma 4. *Let* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, |T| = 1)$ *be the guessing game where the target set is a single pair chosen uniformly at random from* $A \times B$*. If protocol* Π *is an* ϵ*-error protocol for* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, |T| = 1)$ *where* $\epsilon < 1$*, then the number of rounds until* Π *terminates is at least* $\Omega(m)$*.*

The next lemma bounds the number of guesses required when the target set is less restricted and its edges form a random subset of the cross edges between $A \times B$. This will allow us to derive a lower bound on the local broadcast time complexity in terms of the weighted conductance in Theorem 7.

Lemma 5. *For the guessing game input sets* A *and* B*, let* Random_p *be the predicate that defines the target set* T *by adding each element of* $A \times B$ *to* T *with probability* p*, for some* $p \geqslant \Omega(\frac{1}{m})$*. Then, any protocol that solves* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, \mathsf{Random}_p)$ *requires* $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$ *rounds in expectation. On the other hand, if Alice uses the protocol where she submits her* $2m$ *guesses in each round by choosing, for each* $a \in A$*, an element* $b' \in B$ *uniformly at random, and, for each* $b \in B$*, an* $a' \in A$ *uniformly at random, then* $\Omega\left(\frac{\log m}{p}\right)$ *rounds are required in expectation.*

3.4 Lower Bounds for Information Dissemination

In this section we show three different lower bounds. Together, these show what properties cause poor performance in information dissemination protocols: in some graphs, high degree is the cause of poor performance (Theorem 6); in other graphs, poor connectivity (i.e., small ϕ_*) is the cause of poor performance (Theorem 7). And finally, we give a family of graphs where we can see the trade-off between D, Δ, and ϕ_* (Theorem 8). We begin with a result showing that $\Omega(\Delta)$ is a lower bound:

Theorem 6. *For any* $\Delta \in [\omega(1), \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor]$*, there is an* n*-node network that has a weighted diameter of* $O(1)$*, constant (non-weighted) conductance, and a maximum node degree* $\Theta(\Delta)$*,where any algorithm requires* $\Omega(\Delta)$ *rounds to solve local broadcast with constant probability.*

Proof. Consider the network H of n nodes that consists of the guessing game gadget $G(2\Delta, P)$, where predicate P returns an arbitrary singleton target set, combined with a clique of $n - 2\Delta$ vertices (if any) one of which is connected to a single vertex of $G(2\Delta, P)$; all clique edges have latency 1 and the latencies of the edges in $G(2\Delta, P)$ are assigned as described in Lemma 3. By Lemma 4, we know that any guessing game protocol on $\mathsf{Guessing}(2\Delta, |T| = 1)$ requires $\Omega(\Delta)$ rounds for the predicate that returns exactly 1 pair as the target set. Lemma 3 tells us that any gossip algorithm that solves local broadcast in H, must require $\Omega(\Delta)$ rounds. □

We next show that every local broadcast algorithm requires time at least $\Omega(1/\phi_* + \ell_*)$. The following result is given in terms of the weight-ℓ conductance, for any ℓ, and thus also holds for ϕ_*

and ℓ_*. In the proof, we construct a network that corresponds to the bipartite guessing game graph with a target set where each edge is fast with probability ϕ_*. That way, we obtain a network with weighted conductance $\Theta(\phi_*)$, hop diameter $O(1)$, and a weighted diameter of $O(\ell)$. The guessing game lower bound of Lemma 5 tells us that the cost of information dissemination still depends on ϕ_*.

Theorem 7. *For any $\ell \in [1, n]$ and ϕ_ℓ where $\Omega(\log(n)/n) \leqslant \phi_\ell \leqslant 1/2$, there is a network of $2n$ nodes that has a weighted diameter $O(\ell)$ (whp), and weighted conductance $\Theta(\phi_\ell)$ (whp), such that any gossip algorithm requires $\Omega\Big(\frac{1}{\phi_\ell} + \ell\Big)$ rounds for solving local broadcast. Also, solving local broadcast using push-pull requires $\Omega\Big(\frac{\log n}{\phi_\ell} + \ell\Big)$ rounds.*

Finally, we give a family of graphs that illustrate the trade-off among parameters. The intuition is that, when the edge latencies are larger, it makes sense to search for the best possible path and the lower bound is $\Omega(D + \Delta)$; when the edge latencies are smaller, then we can simply rely on connectivity and the lower bound is $\Omega(\ell/\phi_\ell)$.

Theorem 8. *For a given $\alpha \in [\Omega(\frac{1}{n}), O(1)]$ and any integer $\ell \in [1, O(n^2\alpha^2)]$, there is a class of networks of $2n$ nodes, weighted conductance $\phi_* = \phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$, maximum degree $\Delta = \Theta(\alpha n)$, and weighted diameter $D = \Theta(\frac{1}{\phi_\ell})$, such that any gossip algorithm that solves broadcast with at least constant probability, requires $\Omega\Big(\min\Big\{\Delta + \mathsf{D}, \frac{\ell}{\phi_\ell}\Big\}\Big)$ rounds.*

Proof. We create a network G consisting of a series of k node layers $V_1, \ldots, V_k$ that are wired together as a ring, using the guessing game gadgets introduced above. We define $k = \frac{2}{c\alpha}$ where $c = \Big(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{9 - \frac{8}{n\alpha}}\Big)$. This implies that $1 \leqslant c < 3/2$ as $\alpha \in [\Omega(\frac{1}{n}), O(1)]$. Each layer consists of $s = cn\alpha$ nodes. As it does not change our asymptotic bounds, we simplify the notation by assuming that $2/c\alpha$ and $cn\alpha$ are integers.

For each pair V_i and $V_{(i+1) \bmod k}$ $(0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1)$, we construct the (symmetric) guessing game gadget $G^{\text{sym}}(2cn\alpha, P)$ (see Section 3.2), for simulating a gossip algorithm to solve the game $\mathsf{Guessing}(2cn\alpha, |T| = 1)$. That is, we create a complete bipartite graph on V_i and $V_{(i+1) \bmod k}$ and form cliques on V_i respectively $V_{(i+1) \bmod k}$ as shown in Figure 2. Then, we assign latency ℓ to every cross edge between V_i and $V_{(i+1) \bmod k}$, except for a uniformly at random chosen edge that forms the (singleton) target set, which we assign latency 1.

Let us denote the weight-ℓ conductance (resp. weight-1 conductance) of the constructed graph G to be ϕ_ℓ (resp. ϕ_1). Observe that here $\phi_j = 0$ for all j not equalling either 1 or ℓ. To show that the weighted conductance of the graph ϕ_* is indeed $\Theta(\alpha)$, we use the following lemmas (proof in Appendix A).

We define a cut C that divides the ring into two equal halves such that none of the internal clique edges are cut edges. We also use C to denote the set of vertices present in the smaller side of the partition created by the cut C (ties broken arbitrarily).

Lemma 9. $\phi_\ell(C) = \alpha$.

Using the conductance bound of Lemma 9 for cut C, we know that $\phi_\ell \leqslant \alpha$. In the proof of the next lemma, we show that $\phi_\ell = \Omega(\alpha)$. To this end, we consider a given set of vertices U and distinguish two cases. If U is small, we can argue that the nodes in U have sufficiently many neighbors connected by latency ℓ edges outside of U—thus showing that $\phi_\ell(U) = \Omega(\alpha)$. On the other hand, if U is large, we proceed by a carefully analyzing the intersections of U with the layers of graph G. More specifically, we define an procedure that, starting at a node in some layer A,

checks whether there are sufficiently many cross edges in the successor layer A' of G. If that is the case, we obtain the required bound on $\phi_\ell(U)$ and stop the procedure; otherwise, we argue that U contains many nodes in layer A'. Then, we repeat this for the successor layer A', thus sequentially exploring all layers of G. Since U can contain at most half of the nodes in G, we eventually reach a layer that contains sufficiently many cross edges, thus again showing the bound for $\phi_\ell(U)$.

Lemma 10. *The weight-ℓ conductance of the constructed ring network is $\phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$.*

Combining Lemmas 9 and 10 (and again using cut C), we argue that the critical latency is ℓ.

Lemma 11. *For any $\ell \leqslant O(cn\alpha)^2$, we have $\phi_* = \phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$.*

The weighted diameter of the network $D = \Theta(k/2)$, since each pair of adjacent node layers is connected by a latency 1 edge and, internally, each layer forms a latency 1 clique. Using the fact that $c \in [1, \frac{3}{2})$, it can be easily shown that $(2/3\alpha) < D \leqslant (1/\alpha)$, implying that $D = \Theta(1/\phi_\ell)$ (by Lemma 10).

Now, consider a source node in layer V_1 that initiates the broadcast of a rumor. Each node can either spend time in finding the required fast edge (which we assume can be done in parallel) or, instead, it can instantly use an edge of latency ℓ to forward the message. Lemma 4 tells us that finding the single latency 1 cross edge with constant probability, for the guessing game gadget corresponding to any pair of node layers, requires $\Omega(\Delta)$ rounds, and then forwarding the rumor takes $\Omega(D)$ additional rounds. Alternatively, the algorithm can forward the rumor along the latency ℓ edges across node layers and spread the rumor using the latency 1 edges within each clique. It follows that the required time for broadcast is $\Omega\Big(\min\Big\{\Delta + D, \frac{\ell}{\phi_\ell}\Big\}\Big)$. □

4 Algorithms for Unknown Latencies

We divide the upper bounds on Information Dissemination into two sub-components and later combine them to obtain a unified result. First, we analyze classical push-pull, showing that it completes in time $O(\frac{\ell_* \log n}{\phi_*})$, which is optimal when $D + \Delta$ is large. Alternatively for graphs where $D + \Delta$ is small, we give an algorithm wherein each node first spends $\tilde{O}(D + \Delta)$ time[6] discovering the neighboring latencies after which nodes use the local information to build a spanner across which data can be distributed in $\tilde{O}(D)$ time.

4.1 Push-Pull

To show the time required for information dissemination in a weighted graph G using push-pull, we define E_ℓ as the *set of all edges of latency $\leqslant \ell$*, E_u as the *set of incident edges of vertex u* and $E_{u,\ell} := E_\ell \cap E_u$.

Theorem 12. *The push-pull protocol achieves broadcast with high probability in $O(\frac{\ell_* \log n}{\phi_*})$ rounds in a network G, where ϕ_* is the weighted conductance of G and ℓ_* is the corresponding critical latency.*

Proof Sketch. (Complete proof in Appendix A.) We construct a strongly edge-induced graph G_ℓ, which is a generalization of the strongly (vertex) induced subgraph defined in [1], having the same

[6]The $\tilde{O}$ here refers to additional polylog factors that arise from estimate D and Δ when they are unknown.

vertex set as G. The edges of G_ℓ have a multiplicity defined by the *edge multiplicity function* $\mu : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ of G_ℓ, given by

$$\mu(u,v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (u,v) \in E_\ell \\ |E_u| - |E_{u,\ell}| & \text{if } u = v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

We show that the conductance $\phi(G_\ell) = \phi_\ell(G)$ and that the Markov process describing the *informed node set* when running push-pull on G dominates over corresponding Markov process in G_ℓ, when ℓ rounds in G is simulted as a single round in G_ℓ. Using known results from [11] we see that broadcast can be solved in G_ℓ in $O(\log(n)/\phi(G_\ell))$ rounds w.h.p. and hence broadcast in G would require $O(\ell \log(n)/\phi_\ell(G)$ rounds. Since the above analysis applies for any $\ell \geqslant 1$, specifically for the critical latency ℓ_*, the theorem follows. □

4.2 Spanner Algorithm

In Section 5.1 we provide an algorithm that solves all-to-all information dissemination when each node knows the latencies of all its adjacent edges. The same algorithm can be naturally extended for the case where nodes do not know the adjacent latencies by first discovering the edge latencies and then running the algorithm as such. When both D and Δ are known: for Δ rounds, each node broadcasts a request to each neighbor (sequentially) and then waits up to D rounds for a response to determine the latency of its adjacent edges. In case both or either values are unknown, the standard guess and double strategy (similar to the procedure described in Section 5.3) can be used, as we can efficiently detect when information dissemination has completed correctly. By similar arguments as that in Section 5.3 we obtain an algorithm that solves information dissemination in $O((D + \Delta) \log^3 n)$ time.

5 Algorithms for Known Latencies

In this section, we focus on the case where each node knows the latencies of the adjacent edges. Here we focus on the problem of all-to-all information dissemination (instead of one-to-all information dissemination), as it will simplify certain issues to solve the seemingly harder problem. (Of course, all-to-all information dissemination also solves one-to-all information dissemination. And most one-to-all information dissemination algorithms can be used to solve all-to-all information dissemination by using them to collect and disseminate data.)

In Section 5.1, we use the fact that nodes have a polynomial upper bound on the network size (and this is the only place in this paper where we rely on that assumption). We also provide an alternative deterministic algorithm in Appendix E that does not require the knowledge of the upper bound on n, but takes an additional $\log D$ factor.

When edge latencies are known, the spanner algorithm (described below) solves all-to-all information dissemination in $O(D \log^3 n)$ which differs from the trivial lower bound of $\Omega(D)$ by only polylog factors.

5.1 Spanner Algorithm

We initially assume that the weighted diameter (D) is known to all nodes; later (in Section 5.3), we do away with the assumption via the usual guess-and-double technique. It is assumed w.l.o.g. that every edge has latency $\leqslant D$: clearly we do not want to use any edges with latency $> D$.

The algorithm then leverages the spanner construction of Baswana and Sen [7] to obtain a sparse communication network. Recall that a subgraph $S = (V, E')$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is called an α-spanner if any two nodes u, v with distance ℓ in G have distance at most $\alpha\ell$ in S. An intermediate goal of our algorithm is to construct an $O(\log n)$-spanner and to obtain an orientation of the edges such that each node has a small, i.e., $O(\log n)$, out-degree.[7] Once we have such a structure, all-to-all information dissemination can be readily solved using a simple flooding algorithm that repeatedly activates the out-edges in round-robin order.

Another important building block of our algorithms is *local broadcast*. For graphs with unweighted edges, the (randomized) Superstep algorithm by Censor-Hillel et al. [1] and the Deterministic Tree Gossip (DTG) algorithm by Haeupler [3] solve this problem. We make use of the DTG algorithm, which runs in $O(\log^2 n)$ rounds on unweighted graphs. For completeness, we provide more details in Appendix C.

We are mainly interested in the *ℓ-local broadcast problem* in which each node disseminates some information to all its neighbors that are connected to it by an edge of latency $\leqslant \ell$. While the DTG protocol assumes edges to be unweighted (uniform weight), we can execute the same protocol in a graph with non-uniform latencies simply by ignoring all edges with a latency larger than ℓ and simulating 1 round of the DTG protocol as ℓ rounds in our network.

We refer to this protocol as the ℓ-DTG protocol. It follows immediately that within $O(\ell \log^2 n)$ time, the ℓ-DTG protocol ensures that each node has disseminated the information to all its neighbors connected to it with edges of latency $\leqslant \ell$. Note that we can trivially solve the all-to-all information dissemination problem in $O(D^2 \log^2 n)$ time using ℓ-DTG protocol (if D were known) by simply repeating it D times with $\ell = D$.

5.2 Spanner Construction and Broadcast

We modify the algorithm of [7] by associating a direction with every edge that is added to a spanner. We provide a description of the algorithm in Appendix D. Note that the algorithm in [7] also assumes that all edge weights are distinct. We can ensure this by using the unique node IDs to break ties. We first show that the size of the obtained spanner does not increase significantly when running the algorithm of [7] with $\hat{n}$ instead of n.

Lemma 13. *Consider a synchronous network of n nodes and suppose that nodes know only an estimate $\hat{n}$ of n, where $n \leqslant \hat{n} \leqslant n^c$, for some constant $c \geqslant 1$. For any $k \geqslant c$, there is a distributed algorithm (based on [7]) that terminates in $O(k)$ rounds in the $\mathcal{LOCAL}$ model and each nodes out-degree is $O(n^{\frac{c}{k}} \log n)$ w.h.p.*

The above lemma can be proved by a careful implementation of the Baswana and Sen [7] spanner and a rigorous application of probability. The detailed proof can be found in Appendix A.

Theorem 14. *There is an $O(D \log^3 n)$ time algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ in the gossip model that yields an $O(\log n)$-spanner that has $O(n \log n)$ edges (whp). Moreover, $\mathcal{A}$ also computes an orientation of the edges that guarantees that each node has an out-degree of $O(\log n)$ (whp).*

Proof. To convert the classic synchronous algorithm for the local model assumed in Lemma 13 to an algorithm that works in the gossip model with latencies, we make use of the solution to local broadcast as done in [1], [3]. We use the ℓ-DTG protocol and simulate each of the $k = \log n$ iterations of the spanner algorithm by first discovering the $\log n$-hop neighborhood. The neighborhood discovery takes $O(D \log^3 n)$ rounds in our model and then all computations are done locally. □

[7] It is clearly impossible to guarantee small degree in an undirected sense, e.g., if the original graph is a star.

To broadcast on this directed spanner we use the RR broadcast algorithm (pseudocode in Appendix B), which is a deterministic round-robin-style exchange of information among nodes. Each node sends all the rumors known to it to all its 1-hop neighbors one by one in a round robin fashion. The algorithm with a parameter k is run on the directed spanner of the graph G_k (G only with edges of latency $\leqslant k$).

Lemma 15. *After the execution of RR Broadcast algorithm with a parameter k on the directed spanner of graph G_k, any two nodes u and v at a distance $\leqslant k$ in G have exchanged rumors with one another in $O(k\Delta_{out} + k)$ rounds, where Δ_{out} is the maximum out-degree of any node in G_k.*

Here, on the created spanner with stretch of $O(\log n)$, the maximum distance between any two nodes can be $O(D \log n)$. Since the maximum out-degree (Δ_{out}) is $O(\log n)$ w.h.p., we get the following corollary.

Corollary 16. *The RR broadcast algorithm on the constructed spanner takes $O(D \log^2 n)$ time and solves all-to-all information dissemination w.h.p.*

We combine all the previously defined techniques to a single algorithm called Efficient Information Dissemination or EID (pseudo code in Appendix B). The overall complexity can be easily determined by analysing the individual complexities.

Lemma 17. *For a graph G with diameter D, Efficient Information Dissemination (EID) algorithm takes $O(D \log^3 n)$ time for solving all-to-all information dissemination w.h.p. when D is known to all the nodes.*

5.3 Unknown Diameter

When the diameter is unknown, we can apply the standard guess-and-double strategy: begin with an initial guess of 1 for D. Try the algorithm and see if it succeeds. If so, we terminate. Otherwise, double the estimate and repeat.

The key to such a strategy is determining when to terminate. The critical observation is as follows: if two nodes u and v cannot communicate in one execution of all-to-all information dissemination (protocol RR Broadcast) for a given estimate of the diameter, then there must be some edge (w, z) on the path from u to v where, in one execution: u is able to communicate with w but not with z. There are two cases: If w is not able to communicate with z, then it is aware that it has an unreachable neighbor and can flag the issue; the next time that u and w communicate, node u learns of the problem. Otherwise, if w can communicate with z, then the next time that u and w communicate, node u learns that there was a node it did not hear from previously. In either case, u knows that the estimate on D was not correct and should continue.

Therefore, to check termination, we execute all-to-all information dissemination (using RR Broadcast protocol), where each node keeps track of the nodes heard from. Each node also checks whether it has heard from all of its neighbors, and raises an error flag if not. We then repeat all-to-all information dissemination so that nodes can check that everyone has the same "rumor set" and that no one has raised an error flag. In total, checking termination has asymptotic complexity of $O(D \log^2 n)$.

We describe this procedure in more detail, and how it is integrated into the RR Broadcast protocol, in Appendix B. We prove the following regarding the termination detection:

Lemma 18. *No node terminates until it has exchanged rumors with all other nodes. Moreover, all nodes terminate in the same round.*

Combining the all-to-all information dissemination protocol with the termination detection, we get the following:

Theorem 19. *There exists a randomized gossip algorithm that solves the all-to-all information dissemination problem w.h.p. and terminates in $O(D \log^3 n)$ rounds.*

6 Unified Upper Bounds

Combining the results shown above, we can run both push-pull and the spanner algorithm in parallel to obtain unified upper bounds for both the known and the unknown latencies cases. However, we point out that, for single source broadcast, push-pull works with small message sizes whereas the spanner algorithm does not (because of its reliance on DTG). Also, exchanging messages with the help of the spanner does not have good robustness properties whereas push-pull is inherently quite robust.

Theorem 20. *There exists randomized gossip algorithms that solves the all-to-all information dissemination problem in $O(\min((D+\Delta)\log^3 n), (\ell_*/\phi_*)\log(n))$ time when latencies are unknown and in $O(\min(D\log^3 n, (\ell_*/\phi_*)\log(n)))$ time when latencies are known.*

7 Conclusion

We have presented a new property, weighted conductance, to characterize the connectivity of weighted graphs. We believe that weighted conductance will be useful for a variety of applications that depend on connectivity.

An interesting question that remains is whether the running time of $O(D \log^3 n)$ for information dissemination can be improved, e.g., using better spanner constructions or more efficient local broadcast to save the polylogarithmic factors. (Recall that in the unweighted case, there are information dissemination protocols that run in $O(D + \mathsf{polylog} n)$ time.)

It also remains open as to whether information dissemination can be completed efficiently with small messages. When latencies are unknown, push-pull does not require large messages. In the other cases, however, larger messages are needed—and there are reasons to suspect this is inherent.

Another issue is whether we can reduce the number of *incoming* messages in a round; recently, Daum et. al. [24] have considered such a more restricted model, yielding interesting results. It would also be interesting to look at the bounds where each node is only allowed $O(1)$ connections per round, whether initiated by the node itself or by its neighbor.

Finally, we do not take into account the possibility of node or link failures. Again, push-pull is relatively robust to failures, while our other approaches are not. An interesting direction would be to find tight bounds and to develop robust fault-tolerant algorithms.



(a) $G(\mathrm{P})$ (b) $G^{sym}(\mathrm{P})$

Figure 1: Guessing Game Gadgets. The red thick edges correspond to "fast" links whereas the blue thin edges are "slow" links with high latency.



Figure 2: Guessing Game Gadgets wired together as a ring.

A Omitted Proofs

Lemma 4. *Let* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, |T| = 1)$ *be the guessing game where the target set is a single pair chosen uniformly at random from* $A \times B$*. If protocol* Π *is an* ϵ*-error protocol for* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, |T| = 1)$ *where* $\epsilon < 1$*, then the number of rounds until* Π *terminates is at least* $\Omega(m)$*.*

Proof. For the sake of a contradiction, suppose that Π solves $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, |T| = 1)$ in $t < \frac{m}{2} - 1$ rounds. We define Time to be the random variable of the number of rounds until termination in a given execution of Π.

Consider a round $r \geqslant 1$ of the protocol and suppose that the game has not yet ended, i.e., Alice has not yet guessed all of T correctly and has made at most $2m(r-1)$ (incorrect) guesses in the previous rounds. Let X_r denote the (at most $2m$) pairs from $A \times B$ chosen by Alice in round r. Since from Alice's point of view, the adversary has chosen the single element of T uniformly at random from the m^2 elements in $A \times B$, the probability that Alice guesses the element of T in round r is at most $\frac{2m}{m^2 - 2m(r-1)} \leqslant \frac{2}{m-2r}$. Let $\mathsf{Correct}$ denote the event that protocol Π correctly solves the game. It follows that

$$\Pr[\mathsf{Time} = r \mid \mathsf{Correct}] = \Pr[T_r \subseteq X_r \mid \mathsf{Correct}] \leqslant \tfrac{2}{m-2r}. \tag{4}$$

In the remainder of the proof, we will lower bound the probability of event $\{\mathsf{Time} > t\}$. Observe that

$$\Pr[\mathsf{Time} > t] \geqslant \Pr[\mathsf{Time} > t \mid \mathsf{Correct}]\ \Pr[\mathsf{Correct}].$$

If $\mathsf{Time} > t$, then none of the rounds $1, \ldots, t$ guesses of Alice were successful, i.e.,

$$\Pr[\mathsf{Time} > t \mid \mathsf{Correct}] \geqslant \prod_{i=1}^{t} (1 - \Pr[\mathsf{Time} = i \mid \mathsf{Correct}]).$$

Applying (4) to each round $i \leqslant t$, we get

$$\Pr[\mathsf{Time} > t] \geqslant \prod_{i=1}^{t} \left(1 - \frac{2}{m - 2i}\right)(1 - \epsilon) \geqslant \left(1 - \frac{1}{\frac{m}{2} - t}\right)^{t} (1 - \epsilon).$$

Since the running time of Π never exceeds t rounds, i.e., $\Pr[\mathsf{Time} > t] = 0$ and $\epsilon < 1$, we get a contradiction to $t < \frac{m}{2} - 1$. □

Lemma 5. *For the guessing game input sets* A *and* B*, let* Random_p *be the predicate that defines the target set* T *by adding each element of* $A \times B$ *to* T *with probability* p*, for some* $p \geqslant \Omega(\frac{1}{m})$*. Then, any protocol that solves* $\mathsf{Guessing}(2m, \mathsf{Random}_p)$ *requires* $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)$ *rounds in expectation. On the other hand, if Alice uses the protocol where she submits her* $2m$ *guesses in each round by choosing, for each* $a \in A$*, an element* $b' \in B$ *uniformly at random, and, for each* $b \in B$*, an* $a' \in A$ *uniformly at random, then* $\Omega\left(\frac{\log m}{p}\right)$ *rounds are required in expectation.*

Proof. Recall that the game ends when the guesses of Alice have hit each element in $T^B \subseteq B$ at least once, whereas T^B is itself a random variable. Let Y be the maximum number of guesses required by Alice' protocol Π. For the sake of our analysis, we will consider Alice's guesses as occurring sequentially and hence we can assume that elements of T^B are discovered one by one. For

each $j \geqslant 1$, we define Z_j to denote the number of guesses required to guess the j-th element of T^B, after having already guessed $j-1$ elements.

We will first consider general protocols. Considering that each edge is in the target set with probability p, we can assume that the target membership of an edge e is determined only at the point when Alice submits e as a guess. Recalling that Alice has full knowledge of the remaining elements in T^B that she still needs to guess (cf. (2)), we can assume that her guess is successful with probability p (as she will only guess edges that potentially discover a new element in T^B). For this guessing strategy, this remains true independently of the current target set and the set of previously discovered elements (which we denote by D_j). Formally, $\Pr[Z_j \mid D_j, T] = \Pr[Z_j]$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[Z_j \mid D_j, T] = \mathbb{E}[Z_j] = \lceil 1/p \rceil$. Note that any $b \in B$ will be part of some target edge in T, i.e., $b \in T^B$, with probability $\geqslant 1-(1-p)^m = \Omega(1)$, since $p = \Omega(1/m)$, and therefore $\mathbb{E}[|T|] = \Omega(m)$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Y \mid D_j, T]] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{|T|} \mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid D_j, T]\Big] = \mathbb{E}\Big[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{|T|} \mathbb{E}[Z_i]\Big] = \Omega(\frac{m}{p}).$$

Considering that Alice can guess up to $2m$ elements per round, it follows that the time is $\Omega(\frac{1}{p})$, which completes the proof for general algorithms.

Now consider the case where Alice uses the protocol where she submits her $2m$ guesses in each round by choosing, for each $a \in A$, an element $b' \in B$ uniformly at random, and, for each $b \in B$, an $a' \in A$ uniformly at random. Note that this process of selecting her guesses is done obliviously of her (correct and incorrect) guesses so far.

Observe that Z_j depends on a random variable F_j, which is the size of T after the $(j-1)$-th successful guess. Since Z_j is the number of times that the protocol needs to guess until a *new* element in T^B is discovered, the distribution of Z_j corresponds to a geometric distribution. According to Alice's protocol, the probability of guessing a new element is given by $\frac{F_j}{m^2}$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[Z_j \mid F_j] \geqslant \frac{m^2}{F_j}$. Let $U = |T_1^B|$; i.e., U is the number of all elements in B that are part of an edge in T initially. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big[Y \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}\big] &= \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[Y \mid F_i] \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}\big] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\Big[\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{U} \mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid F_i] \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}\Big] \\
&\geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}\big[\mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid F_i] \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}\big] \\
&\geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \frac{m^2}{\mathbb{E}\big[F_i \mid U \geqslant \frac{m}{2}\big]},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\mathbb{E}[1/X] \geqslant 1/\mathbb{E}[X]$, for any positive random variable X, due to Jensen's Inequality. Since Alice has already correctly guessed $i-1$ elements from T^B, we discard all elements that "intersect" with successful guesses when updating the target set at the end of each round, according to (2). It can happen that the protocol discovers multiple elements of T^B using the round r guesses (which we have assumed to happen sequentially in this analysis). In that case, the target set is not updated in-between guesses. However, it is easy to see that this does not increase the probability of guessing a new element of T^B. We get

$$\mathbb{E}\big[F_i \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}\big] \leqslant (m-i)mp,$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}[Y \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}] \geqslant \frac{m}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{m-i}.$$

This sum is the harmonic number $H_{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor - 1}$, which is $\Theta(\log m)$, for sufficiently large m, and hence

$$\mathbb{E}[Y \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}] \geqslant \Omega\Big(\frac{m \log m}{p}\Big).$$

By the law of total expectation it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[Y] \geqslant \mathbb{E}[Y \mid U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}] \Pr[U \geqslant \tfrac{m}{2}].$$

Finally, a standard probability calculation shows that $U \geqslant \frac{m}{2}$ happens with large probability, assuming that $p \geqslant \frac{c}{m}$ for a sufficiently large constant $c > 0$. The time bound follows since Alice can submit $2m$ guesses per round. □

Theorem 7. *For any $\ell \in [1, n]$ and ϕ_ℓ where $\Omega(\log(n)/n) \leqslant \phi_\ell \leqslant 1/2$, there is a network of $2n$ nodes that has a weighted diameter $O(\ell)$ (whp), and weighted conductance $\Theta(\phi_\ell)$ (whp), such that any gossip algorithm requires $\Omega\Big(\frac{1}{\phi_\ell} + \ell\Big)$ rounds for solving local broadcast. Also, solving local broadcast using push-pull requires $\Omega\Big(\frac{\log n}{\phi_\ell} + \ell\Big)$ rounds.*

Proof. Our goal is to reduce the game $\mathsf{Guessing}(2n, \mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell})$ to local broadcast, hence we consider the $2n$-node graph $G(\mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell})$ as our guessing game gadget defined in Section 3.2. We assign each cross edge latency ℓ independently with probability ϕ_ℓ and latency n with probability $1 - \phi_\ell$. The fast cross edges have the same distribution as the target set implied by the predicate $\mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell}$, which we have used to show a lower bound of $\Omega(\frac{1}{\phi_\ell})$ for general protocols on $\mathsf{Guessing}(2n, \mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell})$ in Lemma 5, and also a stronger lower bound of $\Omega(\frac{\log n}{\phi_\ell})$ for "random guessing" protocols, which choose a random edge for each vertex as their guesses. It is straightforward to see that push-pull gossip corresponds exactly to this random guessing game strategy. Applying Lemma 3, this means that local broadcast requires in expectation $\Omega(\frac{1}{\phi_\ell})$ time for general algorithms and $\Omega(\frac{\log n}{\phi_\ell})$ time for push-pull. The additional term of $\Omega(\ell)$ in the theorem statement is required to actually send the broadcast over the latency ℓ edge once it is discovered.

Since each edge of $L \times R$ is assigned latency ℓ with probability $\phi_\ell = \Omega(\log(n)/n)$, it follows that each $u \in R$ is connected by a latency ℓ edge to some node in L with high probability. Hence the weighted diameter of $G(\mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell})$ is $O(\ell)$ whp.

In the remainder of the proof, we show that $G(\mathsf{Random}_{\phi_\ell})$ has a conductance of $\Theta(\phi_\ell)$ with high probability. We point out that several previous works prove bounds on the network expansion (e.g., [25] and [26]). However, as these results were shown for random graphs, we cannot employ these results directly and thus need to adapt these proof techniques to show a conductance of $\Theta(\phi_\ell)$ for our guessing game gadget.

We assume that there is an integer-valued function $f = f(n)$, such that $\frac{f}{n} = \phi_\ell$, noting that this assumption does not change the asymptotic behaviour of our bounds. For readability, we only consider $\ell = 1$ and note that the extension to the general case is straightforward. By construction, $G(\mathsf{Random}_{f/n})$ consists of edges with latencies 1 or n and we have

$$\frac{n}{\phi_n} \geqslant n \geqslant \frac{\log n}{\phi_1},$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption $\phi_1 \geqslant \Omega\Big(\frac{\log n}{n}\Big)$. Thus, we know that $\phi_* = \phi_1$ and hence we need to prove $\phi_1 = \Theta(f/n)$.

Consider a set $S \subseteq L \cup R$ of at most n vertices and let $l = |S \cap L|$ and $r = |S \cap R|$. We first assume that $l \geqslant r$, since the number of latency 1 cross edges is symmetric for vertices in L and R; subsequently, we will remove this assumption by a union bound argument.

For vertex sets A and B, let $E_1(A, B)$ be the set of the (randomly sampled) latency 1 edges in the cut (A, B) and define $e_1(A, B) = |E_1(A, B)|$. Given the set S, our goal is to show that many latency 1 edges originating in $S \cap L$ have their other endpoint in $R \setminus S$, assuming that there are sufficiently many latency 1 cross edges to begin with. In other words, we need to bound from above the probability of the event $e_1(S \cap L, S \cap R) \geqslant \Omega(fl)$ conditioned that there are sufficiently many latency 1 cross edges.

Claim 21 (Sufficiently many latency 1 cross edges)**.** *There exist constants $c, c' > 0$, such that events*

$$\mathsf{LR} := \{\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon (e_1(S \cap L, R) \geqslant cfl) \wedge (e_1(S \cap R, L) \geqslant cfr)\}, \tag{5}$$

$$\mathsf{LR}^- := \{\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon (e_1(S \cap L, R) \leqslant c'fl) \wedge (e_1(S \cap R, L) \leqslant c'fr)\} \tag{6}$$

occur with high probability.

Proof. According to the construction of $\mathsf{Random}_{f/n}$, the latency 1 cross edges are chosen independently each with probability f/n. Note that each cross edges is assigned latency 1 independently with probability $f/n = \Omega(\frac{\log n}{n})$. Thus, for each node v, the expected number of cross edges is $f = \Omega(\log n)$ and, by a standard Chernoff bound, we know that the number of latency 1 cross edges to v is in $[c_1 f, c_2 f]$ with high probability, for suitable constants $c_2 \geqslant c_1 > 0$. After taking a union bound over all nodes in $V(G)$, we can conclude that the claim holds for any set $S \subseteq V(G)$. □

Conditioning on LR is equivalent with choosing a subset of (at least) cfl edges among all possible edges in the cut $E_1(S \cap L, R)$ uniformly at random and assigning them latency 1. Consider an edge $(v, u) \in E_1(S \cap L, R)$. It follows that $u \in S \cap R$ (and hence $(v, u) \in E_1(S \cap L, S \cap R)$), with probability $\frac{r}{n}$ and we need to exclude the event

$$\mathsf{Bad}(S) := \{e_1(S \cap L, S \cap R) \geqslant \tfrac{4}{5}cfl\},$$

for all $\binom{cfl}{\frac{4}{5}cfl}$ subsets of latency 1 edges incident to vertices in $S \cap L$. In addition, we need to bound the probability that $\mathsf{Bad}(S)$ happens, for S chosen in any of the $\binom{n}{l}$ ways of choosing S that satisfy $|S \cap L| = l$.

Claim 22. $\Pr[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}] \leqslant n^{-\Omega(1)}$.

Proof of claim. Combining the above observations, we get

$$\Pr[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}] \leqslant \binom{n}{l}\binom{cfl}{\frac{4}{5}cfl}\Big(\frac{r}{n}\Big)^{\frac{4}{5}cfl}. \tag{7}$$

First, we assume that r and l are both large, i.e., $l \geqslant r \geqslant c'n$, for a sufficiently small positive constant $c' < \frac{4}{5e}$. Then, we can apply Stirling's approximation of the form $\binom{m}{k} \approx 2^{m \cdot \mathrm{H}_2(\frac{k}{m})}$, where $\mathrm{H}_2(x) = -x\log_2(x) - (1-x)\log(1-x)$ is the binary entropy function. Thus, for sufficiently large n, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\big[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}\big] &\leqslant 2^{n \cdot \mathrm{H}_2(\frac{l}{n}) + cfl\mathrm{H}_2\left(\frac{4}{5}\right)} \cdot \left(\frac{r}{n}\right)^{\frac{4}{5}cfl} \\ &\leqslant 2^{n + cfl \cdot \mathrm{H}_2\left(\frac{4}{5}\right) - \frac{4}{5}cfl}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where, to derive the second inequality, we have used the facts that $\mathrm{H}_2(\frac{l}{n}) \leqslant 1$ and $\frac{r}{n} \leqslant \frac{1}{2}$, since $r + l \leqslant n$ and $r \leqslant l$. By the premise of the theorem, $f = \Omega(\log n)$, which implies $c\ f\ l = \Omega(n \log n)$. Together with the fact that $\mathrm{H}_2(\frac{4}{5}) < \frac{4}{5}$, this means that the term $(-\frac{4}{5}c\ f\ l)$ dominates in the exponent of (8) and hence

$$\Pr\big[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}\big] \leqslant 2^{-\Theta(n \log n)}.$$

Next, we consider the case where $r \leqslant l < c'n$. Applying the upper bound of the form $\binom{m}{k} \leqslant (\frac{em}{k})^k$ to (7), tells us that

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\big[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}\big] &\leqslant \left(\frac{en}{l}\right)^l \left(\frac{5e\ r}{4n}\right)^{\frac{4}{5}cfl} \\ &\leqslant \left(\frac{en}{l}\right)^l \left(\frac{5c'e}{4}\right)^{\frac{4}{5}cfl}, \end{aligned}$$

since $r < c'n$. We get

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\big[\exists S\colon \mathsf{Bad}(S) \mid \mathsf{LR}\big] &\leqslant \exp\left(l\left(1 + \log n - \log l + \frac{4}{5}cfl\log\left(\frac{5}{4}c'e\right)\right)\right) \\ &\leqslant \exp\left(l\left(1 + \log n + \frac{4}{5}cfl\log\left(\frac{5}{4}c'e\right)\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $c' < \frac{4}{5e}$ and hence the term $\frac{4}{5}c\ f\ l\log\left(\frac{5}{4}c'e\right)$ in the exponent is negative. Moreover, recall that $f = \Omega(\log n)$ and thus we can assume that $\frac{4}{5}c\ f\ l\log\left(\frac{5}{4}c'e\right) \leqslant -c''\log n$, for a sufficiently large constant $c'' > 0$. This term dominates the other terms in the exponent, thereby completing the proof of the claim. □

Considering that $l \geqslant \frac{|S|}{2}$, the above bound implies that at least $\lfloor \frac{cf|S|}{10} \rfloor$ latency 1 edges incident to S are connected to nodes outside in S, with probability at least $1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}$. Taking a union bound over all possible choices for the values of l and r adhering to $r \leqslant l$ and $r + l \leqslant n = \frac{|V(G)|}{2}$, shows that

$$\Pr\Big[\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon e_1(S \cap L, R \setminus S) \geqslant \tfrac{cf|S|}{10} \mid \mathsf{LR}\Big] \geqslant 1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}.$$

Observe that the latency 1 cross edges are constructed symmetrically for the left and right side of the bipartite graph G and thus we can apply the above argument in a similar manner for a set S where $r > l$, conditioned on $e_1(S \cap R, L) \geqslant cfl$. Thus we can conclude that

$$\Pr\Big[\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon e_1(S, V(G) \setminus S) \geqslant \tfrac{cf|S|}{10} \mid \mathsf{LR}\Big] \geqslant 1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}. \tag{9}$$

We can remove the conditioning in (9) by virtue of Claim (21), since

$$\Pr\Big[\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon e_1(S, V(G)\setminus S) \geqslant \tfrac{cf|S|}{10}\Big] \geqslant \Pr\Big[\forall S, |S| \leqslant n\colon e_1(S, V(G)\setminus S) \geqslant \tfrac{cf|S|}{10} \mid \mathsf{LR}\Big]\Pr[\mathsf{LR}] \geqslant 1 - n^{-\Omega(1)}.$$

To upper bound $\mathsf{Vol}(S)$ for any set S, we take into account the n cross edges of each node in S. Also, if $v \in L$, then we need to account for the $n-1$ incident clique edges of v, yielding $\mathsf{Vol}(S) \leqslant 2|S|n$. Considering the upper bound on the number of latency 1 cross edges given by (6), we have

$$\phi_* = \min_S \phi_1(S) = \min_S \frac{e_1(S, V(G)\setminus S)}{\mathsf{Vol}(S)} \geqslant \min_S \frac{cf|S|}{20|S|n} = \Omega(\tfrac{f}{n}),$$

where the inequality is true with high probability. To see that this bound is tight, observe that $\phi_* \leqslant \phi_1(L)$. By (5) and (6), we know that $e_1(L,R) = \Theta(fn)$ and hence $\phi_1(L) = \Theta\Big(\frac{f}{n}\Big)$ with high probability, as required. This completes the proof of Theorem 7. □

Observation 23. *Let $s = cn\alpha$. Graph G is $(3s-1)$-regular.*

Proof. For a layer V_i, we call $V_{(i-1) \bmod k}$ the *predecessor layer* and $V_{(i+1) \bmod k}$ the *successor layer*. The size of a layer is $s = cn\alpha$. Each node has $2s$ edges to its neighbors in the predecessor resp. successor layer and $s-1$ edges to nodes in its own layer. This means that G is a $(3s-1)$-regular graph. □

Lemma 9. $\phi_\ell(C) = \alpha$.

Proof. Since C partitions G into two sets of identical size, the volume can be determined by considering either partition of size n, thus we focus on the node set C. Also by 23 we know that G is $(3s-1)$-regular. The volume of C can be calculated to be $n(3cn\alpha - 1)$. The number of cut edges of latency $\leqslant \ell$ is $2(cn\alpha)^2$ (by the construction of C). According to Definition 1, the ℓ-weight conductance is given by $\phi_\ell(C) = \frac{2(cn\alpha)^2}{n(3cn\alpha-1)}$. By plugging in the value of c, we can verify that $\phi_\ell(C)$ is exactly equal to α. □

Lemma 10. *The weight-ℓ conductance of the constructed ring network is $\phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 9, we know that $\phi_\ell \leqslant \alpha$ as the actual graph conductance is always $\leqslant$ to any cut conductance. We will now show $\phi_\ell = \Omega(\alpha)$ as well.

By 23 we know that G is $(3s-1)$-regular and therefore for a set of nodes U the volume $\mathsf{Vol}(U)$ is exactly equal to $(3s-1)|U|$. This clearly implies that for any two sets U and V, $\mathsf{Vol}(U) \leqslant \mathsf{Vol}(V)$ if and only if $|U| \leqslant |V|$.

Now, consider an arbitrary cut $(U, V(G)\setminus U)$ of G and suppose that U contains at most half of the nodes of G, i.e., $|U| \leqslant n$, since G has $2n$ nodes. If there are at least $\Theta(s^2)$ cut edges, then, using the fact that $|U| \leqslant n$, we get

$$\phi_\ell(U) \geqslant \Theta(s^2/s|U|) = \Theta(s/|U|) \geqslant \Theta(s/n) \geqslant \Theta(\alpha),$$

and we are done. In the remainder of the proof, we will show that there are $\Theta(s^2)$ cut edges. We distinguish two cases:

1. $|U| \geqslant 3s/4$: We classify each node in U either as *good* if it has at least $s/4$ adjacent edges across the cut $(U, V \setminus U)$ and as *bad* otherwise. Thus, our goal is to identify $\Theta(s)$ good nodes, which in turn implies $\Theta(s^2)$ cut edges.

Let S be an arbitrary subset of $3s/4$ nodes in U. If all nodes in S are good, we are done. Otherwise, let $x \in S$ be a bad node. It is important to note that the following properties are true for every bad node:

(a) Node x is in a layer in G which contains at least $3s/4$ nodes inside U.
(b) The successor layer from x has at least $3s/4$ nodes inside U.

To see why (a) holds, assume that it was not true. Then, x would have at least $s/4$ neighbors in its own layer across the cut, contradicting the assumption that x is bad. Similarly, if (b) was false, x would be connected to at least $s/4$ nodes in the successor layer outside U. (This is true of the predecessor layer too.)

Let A be the successor layer to the layer containing x. We now run the following procedure:

(1) **Invariant:** A contains at least $3s/4$ nodes in U.
(2) If at least half of the nodes in A are good, we are done. Terminate and claim $\Theta(s^2)$ cut edges.
(3) Otherwise, let y be a bad node in A.
(4) Let A' be the successor layer of the layer A. Then, start again at Step (1) with $A = A'$ and $y = x$. From the assertion (b), A' contains at least $3s/4$ nodes in S.

If this procedure ever terminates in Step (2), we are done. Otherwise, it continues around until every layer has been explored. In that case, the invariant implies that every layer contains at least $3s/4$ nodes in U. This implies that $> 1/2$ of the nodes of G are in U, which contradicts the choice of U. Thus, the procedure does terminate, which means there must be at least $\Theta(s^2)$ cut edges, implying $\phi_\ell \geqslant \alpha$.

2. $|U| < 3s/4$: Let m be the number of nodes in U. Since G is $(3s-1)$-regular, the volume of U is $m(3s-1)$. Each node in U now contains at least $s/4$ neighbors outside of U (since it has $\geqslant s$ neighbors and there are only $< 3s/4$ other nodes in U), so the cut size is at least $sm/4$. Thus the conductance of this graph $\phi_\ell \geqslant \frac{(sm/4)}{m(3s-1)} = \Omega(1) \geqslant \Theta(\alpha)$.

Since, $\phi_\ell \leqslant \alpha$ and $\phi_\ell \geqslant \Theta(\alpha)$, it is clearly the case that $\phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$, which is what we wanted to prove. □

Lemma 11. *For any $\ell \leqslant O(cn\alpha)^2$, we have $\phi_* = \phi_\ell = \Theta(\alpha)$.*

Proof. To prove that ϕ_* is in fact ϕ_ℓ, which by Lemma 10 is $\Theta(\alpha)$, we need to show that $(\phi_\ell/\ell) \geqslant (\phi_1/1) = \phi_1$. To this end, let us consider the cut C defined above. We will show that $\frac{\phi_\ell}{\ell} \geqslant \phi_1(C) \geqslant \phi_1$, and since all $\phi_j = 0$ for $j \notin \{1, \ell\}$, we get $\phi_* = \phi_\ell$.

There are two latency 1 cross edges in the cut C and the volume of C can be calculated as in the proof of Lemma 9 to be $n(3cn\alpha - 1)$. Thus, we need to show that

$$\frac{\phi_\ell}{\ell} = \frac{\Theta(\alpha)}{\ell} \geqslant \frac{2}{(3cn\alpha - 1)n}.$$

As c is a constant, the above inequality is true as long as $\ell = O(\alpha^2 n^2)$, which is ensured by the premise of the theorem. □

Theorem 12. *The push-pull protocol achieves broadcast with high probability in $O(\frac{\ell_* \log n}{\phi_*})$ rounds in a network G, where ϕ_* is the weighted conductance of G and ℓ_* is the corresponding critical latency.*

Proof. We construct a strongly edge-induced graph G_ℓ, which is a generalization of the strongly (vertex) induced subgraph defined in [1] and which has the same vertex set as G. The edges of G_ℓ have a multiplicity[8] defined by the *edge multiplicity function* $\mu : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ of G_ℓ, given by

$$\mu(u,v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (u,v) \in E_\ell \\ |E_u| - |E_{u,\ell}| & \text{if } u = v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

It is easy to see that the (unweighted) conductance $\phi(G_\ell)$ corresponds to $\phi_\ell(G)$, as a self-loop at node u is counted as $\mu(u,u)$ edges when computing the volume. We also define another unweighted graph G' that is derived from G by dropping all edge latencies.

Now, we consider the Markov chain process describing the *informed node set*, i.e., the vertex set that is in possession of some message m originating from a vertex v when running push-pull. Formally, the state space of the Markov chain consists of all possible informed node sets. Only paths that correspond to monotonically growing informed node sets have nonzero probability. We will argue that this process on G' (resp. G) dominates the respective process in a graph G_ℓ. We observe that each node v selects an incident edge in E_ℓ from G_ℓ in the push-pull protocol with the same probability as in G'. The probability of choosing an edge $\in E_u \setminus E_\ell$ (i.e., a self loop in case of G_ℓ) is $\mu(u,u)/\sum_{v \in V} \mu(u,v)$ in both graphs. Clearly, choosing a self loop of a node u cannot help in the propagation of the message in G_ℓ, but choosing the corresponding edge in G' might. It follows that the Markov process of reaching any informed node set S in G' dominates over the one in G_ℓ. In other words, reaching an informed node set S with the Markov chain given in G' has at least the same probability as that of reaching S with the Markov process given in G_ℓ.

To translate this result back to our actual network G (with weighted edges), we charge each round of push-pull in G_ℓ to ℓ rounds in G. With similar arguments, it follows that the Markov process of the informed node set given by considering ℓ consecutive rounds of push-pull in G at a time, dominates the one in G_ℓ. From [11] and [1] it is known that $O(\log(n)/\phi(G_\ell))$ rounds suffice w.h.p. to solve broadcast in G_ℓ. Hence, achieving broadcast in G requires $O(\ell \log(n)/\phi_\ell(G))$ rounds. Since the above analysis applies for any $\ell \geqslant 1$, specifically for the critical latency ℓ_*, the theorem follows. □

Lemma 13. *Consider a synchronous network of n nodes and suppose that nodes know only an estimate $\hat{n}$ of n, where $n \leqslant \hat{n} \leqslant n^c$, for some constant $c \geqslant 1$. For any $k \geqslant c$, there is a distributed algorithm (based on [7]) that terminates in $O(k)$ rounds in the $\mathcal{LOCAL}$ model and each node has an out-degree of $O(n^{\frac{c}{k}} \log n)$ w.h.p.*

Proof. Note that the running time of the algorithm is $O(k^2)$ rounds if used with a restricted message size of $O(\log n)$. Inspecting the algorithm reveals that the computation at each node only depends on its k-hop neighborhood in the graph. Also because the decision to remove an edge (u,v) can be taken by either node u or v, each node needs to simulate the running of the algorithm at all its neighbors (to know when to remove the edge (u,v) from consideration) and hence we can simulate the execution of the algorithm locally by first collecting this information regarding $(k+1)$-hop neighborhood in $k+1$ rounds in the $\mathcal{LOCAL}$ model.

We now analyse the difference when running the algorithm with $\hat{n}$ instead of n. First, we observe that sampling clusters with probability $\hat{n}^{(-1/k)}$ does not affect the stretch guarantee. For the sake of our analysis we assume that the spanner is directed: we count every incident edge of v that it adds

[8]The "multiplicity of an edge" is called "edge weight" in [1]. We use a different terminology here to avoid confusion with the latencies of edges and consider "edge weight" as a synonym to edge latency instead.

to its set of spanner edges H_v as an *outgoing edge* of v. The degree bound will follow by showing an upper bound on the number of outgoing edges of each node.

Consider any iteration i in Phase 1 of the algorithm, i.e., $1 \leqslant i < k$. We call a cluster *sampled in iteration i* if it is among the sampled clusters in all iterations $1, \ldots, i$. Every cluster that was sampled in the previous iteration is sampled again with probability $\hat{n}^{-1/k}$. (In the very first iteration, every node counts as a previously sampled cluster.) To bound the number of edges that contribute to the out-degree of a node v, we consider the clusters adjacent to v that were sampled in iteration $i-1$ and order them as $c_1, \ldots, c_q$ in increasing order of the weight of their least weight edge incident to v.

Let A_i be the event that v adds at least l edges to its outdegree in iteration i. Note that A_i occurs if and only if (1) none of the clusters $c_1, \ldots c_l$ is sampled in iteration i and (2) there are at least l active clusters in iteration $i-1$. By the description of Phase 1 (first $k-1$ iterations) of the algorithm, we only add an edge from v to a node in cluster c_j in iteration i if A_i does not happen. We have $\Pr[A_i] \leqslant (1-n^{-c/k})^l$ and taking a union bound over the first $k-1$ iterations and over all n nodes, it follows that the probability of any node adding more than l edges to the spanner in any of the first $k-1$ iterations is at most $\exp(-n^{-c/k}l + \log k + \log n)$. By choosing $l \geqslant \Omega(n^{1/k}(\log n + \log k))$, this probability is $\leqslant n^{-\Omega(1)}$ as required.

In Phase 2 (final iteration), every vertex u adds a least weight (outgoing) edge to every cluster that was sampled in iteration $k-1$. Let X_v be the indicator random variable that vertex v is the center of a cluster sampled in iteration $k-1$ that is incident to u. We have

$$\Pr[X_v] \leqslant n^{-\frac{c(k-1)}{k}} = n^{-c+\frac{c}{k}}.$$

Setting $X = \sum_{v:(u,v)\in G} X_v$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[X] \leqslant n^{1-c+\frac{c}{k}} \leqslant n^{\frac{c}{k}},$$

since $c \geqslant 1$. Since each cluster is sampled independently all X_v are independent, we can apply a standard Chernoff bound to show that, for some sufficiently large constant c_1 depending on c, it holds that

$$\Pr\left[X \geqslant c_1 n^{\frac{c}{k}} \log n\right] \leqslant e^{-\Theta(n^{c/k}\log n)} \leqslant n^{-\Omega(1)}.$$

By taking a union bound over all vertices, we can see the number of edges that each vertex adds to the spanner in Phase 2 is at most $O(n^{\frac{c}{k}} \log n)$ with high probability. Combining this with the bound that we have derived for Phase 1 completes the proof. □



Figure 3: An example of message propagation from node u to node v.

Lemma 15. *After the execution of RR Broadcast algorithm with a parameter k on the directed spanner of graph G_k, any two nodes u and v at a distance $\leqslant k$ in G have exchanged rumors with one another in $O(k\Delta_{out} + k)$ rounds, where Δ_{out} is the maximum out-degree of any node in G_k.*

Proof. Consider a path from a node u to another node v at a distance k or less from it. Clearly, all edges in this path would have a weight of $\leqslant k$. Therefore we can work on G_k (G only with edges of latency $\leqslant k$) as well without affecting the correctness of the algorithm. Also let us assume that the number of hops between u and v to be h which again would be $\leqslant k$, since there are no fractional weights. Let the latency between each hop be denoted by k_i as shown in figure 3. Messages reach the next node when either of the nodes initiate a bidirectional exchange. For example, u's rumor could reach node u_1 either by a request initiated by node u or by u_1, depending upon the direction of the edge uu_1. In the worst case nodes have to try all other $\Delta_{out} - 1$ links before initiating a connection along the required edge where Δ_{out} is the maximum out-degree of any node. After a connection is initialized it takes k_1 time to exchange rumors. By generalization, we observe that in the non-blocking model, the delay that can be incurred before rumor exchange among any two adjacent nodes u_i and u_{i-1} can be $\Delta_{out} + k_i$ in the worst case. In this way u's rumor proceeds towards v in individual steps, each step incurring a maximum cost of $\Delta_{out} + k_i$. A node might receive multiple rumors to propagate in the next round, which its adds to its rumor set and forwards to its neighbors in a round robin fashion. As such, the total worst case delay in rumor exchange among node u and v would be represented by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{h} (\Delta_{out} + k_i) = h\Delta_{out} + \sum_{i=1}^{h} k_i.$$

But we know that both h and $\sum_{i=1}^{h} k_i$ can have a maximum value equal to k . Therefore we conclude that for any two nodes v and u, v's rumor would have reached u and u's rumor would have reached v if all nodes forward rumors in a round robin fashion for $(k\Delta_{out} + k)$ rounds. □

Lemma 18. *No node terminates until it has exchanged rumors with all other nodes. Moreover, all nodes terminate in the same round.*

Proof. Suppose that a node v terminates without having exchanged rumors with some other node w. Considering any path from node v to node w, let u be the farthest node (in hop distance) with which v has exchanged rumors with and let x be the next node in the path.
Case 1 : u has exchanged rumors with x. It implies that v has also exchanged rumors with x, from the condition that all nodes that exchange rumors with one another have the same rumor set. Thus, contradicting the fact that u is the farthest node on the path that v has exchanged rumors with.
Case 2 : u has not exchanged rumors with x. If u had not exchanged rumors with x, then u would have set its flag bit as 1, which would have been detected by v during the broadcast and it would not have terminated. This also gives us a contradiction. Thus, no such node w exists and v terminates only after it has exchanged rumors with all the other nodes.

For the second part of the proof, let consider u and v to be nodes such that v is set for termination and has not set its status to *"failed"* in the Termination_Check algorithm, whereas, in the same iteration, node u has set its status to *"failed"* and hence is set to continue. We show that there cannot be two such nodes in the same round. The node v did not set its status to *"failed"* implying all the nodes that it exchanged rumors with had exactly the same set of rumors, none of the nodes had set its flag bit as 1 and in addition it did not receive a *"failed"* message from any other node. From the first part, we know that the set of nodes that v exchanged rumors with is the entire vertex set of the graph G. That implies, v has also exchanged rumors with u: node u also has the exact set of rumors (which essentially is all the rumors from all the nodes) and does not have a set flag bit. So in the current iteration, if any other node broadcasted a *"failed"* message both v and u would have received it resulting in both nodes to set their status as *"failed"*. Again, since the rumor sets

of both nodes are identical, both nodes would observe the same flag bits of all the nodes. Then node u will also not satisfy the termination condition and will not set its status as *"failed"*. This gives us a contradiction that completes the proof. □

B Pseudocodes

The Termination_Check algorithm checks for every node that v contacts or is contacted by (either directly or indirectly) whether that node has (i) exactly the same rumor set as v and (ii) the value 0 as its flag bit. The flag bit of a node is set to 1 if a neighbor of that node is not present in its rumor set or if the node has not yet exchanged all the rumors known to it presently with all of its neighbors in G that are at a distance $\leqslant$ to the current estimate of D (say k): this condition is easily checked by either doing an additional k-DTG (which does not affect the complexity) or can be checked in parallel with the execution of RR Broadcast. If both of the above conditions are not met, then node v sets its status to *"failed"* and v uses a broadcast algorithm for propagating the *"failed"* message. Any broadcast algorithm that, given a parameter k, is able to broadcast and collect back information from all nodes at a distance $\leqslant k$ from v, can be used. It is easily seen that RR Broadcast satisfies this criteria and can be used in this case. Note that broadcast is achieved here (for General_EID algorithm) by execution of RR Broadcast, however when Path_Discovery algorithm (described later) invokes Termination_Check, broadcast is achieved by execution of the sequence $T(k)$ (also described later). Here, the rumor set known to a particular vertex v is denoted by R_v, $\Gamma(v)$ represents all its neighbors in G whereas k-neighbors refers to only those nodes that are connected with v with an edge of latency k or less. Also, initially node_status of all nodes is set to *"default"*.

Termination_Check (k)

1: **if** (node $w \in \Gamma(v)$ and $w \notin R_v$) or (node v has not exchanged rumors with all k-neighbors) **then**
2: set flag bit, $v_{flag} = 1$
3: **else** set flag bit, $v_{flag} = 0$
4: broadcast and gather all responses from any node u in v's k-distance neighborhood
5: **if** $\exists$ any u such that ($R_v \neq R_u$) or ($u_{flag} = 1$) **then**
6: set node_status = *"failed"*
7: broadcast *"failed"* message to the k-distance neighborhood
8: **if** received message = *"failed"* **then**
9: set node_status = *"failed"*

Algorithm 1: Termination_Check

RR Broadcast (k)

1: **for** each vertex v in parallel **do**
2: **for** iteration i equals 1 to ($k\Delta_{out} + k$) **do**
3: propagate rumor set R_v along the out-edges of length $\leqslant k$ one-by-one in a round robin fashion
4: add all received rumors to R_v

Algorithm 2: RR Broadcast

```
EID (D)
1: for each vertex v in parallel do
2:     for iteration i = 1 to O(log n) do          /* to gain neighborhood information */
3:         Perform D-DTG
4:     call Spanner Construction algorithm          /* executed locally */
5:     call algorithm RR Broadcast (O(D log n))
```

Algorithm 3: Efficient information dissemination

```
General_EID (k)
1: k=1
2: repeat
3:     call algorithm EID (k)
4:     call algorithm Termination_Check (k)
5:     if node_status = "failed" then
6:         k = 2k
7:         set node_status to "default"
8:     else terminate
```

Algorithm 4: General_EID; code for vertex v.

C The DTG Local Broadcast Protocol

In this section, we describe in more detail the DTG protocol that was originally developed in [3] as well as the ℓ-DTG algorithm.

It is clear that the algorithm solves local broadcast because it keeps on contacting new neighbors until it has exchanged rumors with all of its neighbors. The author [3] makes use of binomial trees to derive the time complexity and better explain the working of the algorithm.

The key idea used for deriving the time complexity is to show that when information is propagated in a pipelined manner along the binomial trees (created on-the-fly), then for any node that is still active in the i^{th} iteration, it has a binomial tree of order 2^i (i-tree of depth i: see Figure 4) rooted at it. Furthermore, it is shown that for any two different nodes that are still active in iteration i, their i-trees are vertex disjoint. Since an i-tree is formed by joining two $(i-1)$-trees, the growth rate of an i-tree is exponential which limits the number of iterations to $O(\log n)$. Also, each node on an average needs to contact $O(\log n)$ nodes ($O(i)$ nodes in the i^{th} round). Thus the overall complexity of the algorithm becomes $O(\log^2 n)$. In our case, for ℓ-DTG, the additional waiting time of ℓ increases the time complexity to $O(\ell \log^2 n)$.



Figure 4: i-trees for $i \in 0, 1, 2, 3$

The i-tree can be seen as witness structures that provides an explanation as to why a node was active in that particular iteration. The i-tree rooted at a particular node is built recursively as the

rounds progress and essentially store the information about which other nodes communicated with one another in which particular round as viewed from the root node. For example, in Figure 5 , the labels on the edges denote the time in which the node of the higher level contacted the lower level node (as observed by the root node). The root contacts the nodes in first level in rounds according to their label, the nodes on the first level similarly contact the nodes in the second level in rounds according to their label and so on. This observation also helps in the realisation of the key idea of a node being active in the i^{th} round having an i-tree rooted at it. The nodes in the first level did not contact the root previously as they were busy contacting the nodes of the second level, the nodes of the second level did not contact nodes on the first level as they were busy contacting the nodes in the third level and so on.



Figure 5: 5-tree with edge labels

As shown in the pseudo code, in the initial PUSH sequence, the message is propagated in an decreasing order of connection round number (as observed by the root node: given by the labels on the edges of Figure 4), helping in pipe-lining the roots message to all other nodes of the i-tree. Similarly, during the initial PULL sequence the message from the nodes is pipelined up to the root. The subsequent PULL-PUSH sequence helps in maintaining the symmetry of the algorithm such that if node u learns abut node v, then node v also learns about node u. Finally, the collection of rumors R is updated to the union of rumors collected in the aforementioned sequences.

For ℓ being an integer $\geqslant 1$, we run the modified DTG algorithm on a sub-graph of G, G_ℓ, rather than on G, where G_ℓ contains only the edges of length up to ℓ. Lets denote this algorithm as ℓ-DTG. The algorithm is presented below and each node v belonging to G_ℓ runs it in parallel. $\Gamma(v)$ can be considered as the neighborhood of v comprising of set of nodes that are node v's 1-hop neighbors.

D Spanner Construction Algorithm

Each node v executes a set of rules for adding edges (explained below) and each time one of these rules is triggered, v adds some of its incident edges to the spanner while assigning them as *outgoing* direction. This way, we obtain a low stretch spanner (undirected stretch) where node also has a low out-degree, which we leverage in the subsequent phases of our algorithm.

For a given parameter k, the algorithm computes a $(2k-1)$-spanner by performing k iterations.

ℓ-DTG (ℓ)

$R = v$
for $i = 1$ UNTIL $\Gamma(v) \backslash R = \phi$ **do**
    link to any new neighbor $u_i \in \Gamma(v)$
    $R' = v$
    PUSH :
    for $j = i$ downto 1 **do**
        send rumors in R' to u_j
        wait for ℓ time to receive u_j's rumors
        add all received rumors to R'
    PULL:
    for $j = 1$ to i **do**
        send rumors in R' to u_j
        wait for ℓ time to receive u_j's rumors
        add all received rumors to R'
    $R'' = v$
    perform PULL, PUSH with R''
    $R = R' \cup R''$

Algorithm 5: ℓ-DTG

At the beginning of the i-th iteration, for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1$, every node that was a cluster center in the previous iteration, chooses to become an active cluster with probability $\hat{n}^{-1/k}$, for some $n \leqslant \hat{n} \leqslant \mathsf{poly}(n)$; note that for $i = 1$, every node counts as a previously active center. Then, every active center c broadcasts this information to all cluster members. As a cluster grows by at most 1 hop in each round, this message needs to be disseminated throughout the i-neighborhood of c.[9] Then, every cluster member broadcasts its membership information to all its neighbors to ensure that every node is aware of its adjacent active clusters. For adding edges to the spanner, nodes also remember its set of incident clusters C_{i-1} that were active in iteration $i-1$. With this information in hand, every node u adds some of its incident edges to its set of spanner edges H_u, and also (permanently) discards some edges, as follows:
(Rule 1) If none of u's adjacent clusters in C_{i-1} were sampled in iteration i, then u adds its least weight edge to cluster c as an outgoing edge to H_u and discards all other edges to nodes in c, for every $c \in C_{i-1}$.
(Rule 2) If u has active adjacent clusters, then u will add the edge e_v to some cluster c with the minimum weight among all these clusters and, for each adjacent cluster $c' \in C_{i-1}$ that has a weight less than e_v, node u also adds one outgoing edge to the respective node in c'. All other edges from v to nodes in clusters c and c' are discarded.

In the k-th iteration, every vertex v adds the least weight edge to each adjacent cluster in C_{k-1} to H_v.

[9] By slight abuse of notation, we use c to denote cluster centres and the cluster itself when the distinction is clear from the context.

E An Alternative All-to-All Information Dissemination Algorithm

We propose an alternate algorithm to solve all-to-all information dissemination without any global knowledge (polynomial upper bound of n need not be known) that takes $O(D \log^2 n \log D)$ time. This algorithm works even when nodes cannot initiate a new exchange in every round, and wait till the acknowledgement of the previous message, i.e., communication is blocking.

The algorithm involves repeatedly invoking the ℓ-DTG algorithm with different parameters determined by a particular pattern. The intuition behind the choice of the pattern is to make minimal use of the heavier latency edges by collecting as much information as possible near the heavier latencies before making use of that edge. The pattern for k is derived according to a sequence $T(k)$ that is recursively defined as follows: $T(1) =$ 1-DTG,
$T(2) = T(1) \cdot$ 2-DTG $\cdot\, T(1)$,
$T(4) = T(2) \cdot$ 4-DTG $\cdot\, T(2)$,
$\ldots$,
$T(k) = T(k/2) \cdot k$-DTG $\cdot\, T(k/2)$.
We show that, when the above sequence is run for the particular pattern for length k, it guarantees that any node u and v in the graph G, at a distance of $\leqslant k$, have exchanged their rumors with one another. Overall, the pattern of values of the parameter ℓ is

$$1, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 1, 8, 1, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 1, \ldots, k, \ldots, 1, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 1, 8, 1, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 1,$$

and, for each value ℓ, we perform the ℓ-DTG protocol. That is, $T(k)$ is a sequence of calls to ℓ-DTG with varying parameters according to a known pattern.

Lemma 24. *After the execution of $T(k)$, any node in the weighted graph G (V,E) has exchanged rumors with all other nodes that are at distance k or less from it.*

Proof. We proceed by induction over the path length k. For the base case, recall from [3] that, after running $T(1)$ on G_1, i.e., the subgraph of G induced by edges with latency $\leqslant 1$, any node v has exchanged rumors with all its distance 1 neighbors.

For the inductive step, suppose that the claim is true for $T(k)$, i.e. after running the sequence, any node v has exchanged rumors with all other nodes at a weighted distance $\leqslant k$. To prove the claim for $T(2k)$ (i.e. $T(k)$, $2k$-DTG, $T(k)$), we consider the various possibilities of forming a path of length $2k$.
Case 1: The path consists only of edges with latencies $\leqslant k$. Here we distinguish two sub-cases:

Case 1a: There exists a node m which is equidistant from both end points u and v (see Figure 6). By the induction hypothesis, both nodes u and v would have exchanged rumors with node m in the initial $T(k)$. In the next $T(k)$, node m propagates all rumors that it received from u to v and vice-versa.



Figure 6: Case 1a

Case 1b: No such node middle exists as depicted in Figure 7. Then, after the initial $T(k)$, node u must have exchanged rumors with m_1 and node v with m_2, due to the induction hypothesis. In the invocation of the $2k$-DTG, node m_1 propagates all rumors gained from u to m_2, and

m_2 also propagates all rumors gained from v to m_1. This information then travels from m_1 to u and from m_2 to v in the final $T(k)$.



Figure 7: Case 1b

Case 2: There exists at most one edge e with latency in $[k+1, 2k]$. This situation can yield one of the following two sub-cases:

Case 2a: Edge e is located at one end of the path (see Figure 8). By the induction hypothesis, node v would have exchanged rumors with m in the initial $T(k)$. In the $2k$-DTG, u gets to know this (and other) rumors from m and m also gets to know u's rumors. In the next $T(k)$, node m propagates all rumors gained from u to v.



Figure 8: Case 2a

Case 2b: The edge is located between two inner nodes on the path (see Figure 9). In this case, by the induction hypothesis, node u has exchanged rumors with m_1, whereas node v has exchanged rumors with node m_2 in the initial $T(k)$. In the $2k$-DTG, node m_1 propagates all rumors gained from u to m_2. Moreover, m_2 propagates all rumors gained from v to m_1. These rumors then propagate from m_1 to u and from m_2 to v in the final $T(k)$.



Figure 9: Case 2b

□

Lemma 25. *For known diameter, solving all-to-all information dissemination by executing the sequence $T(D)$, takes $O(D \log^2 n \log D)$ time.*

Proof. From the way the sequence is constructed, we observe the recurrence relation $T(k) = 2T(k/2) + k \log^2 n$. Using standard methods to solve the recurrence completes the proof. □

When the graph diameter is known to all nodes, nodes can just invoke $T(D)$ to solve all-to-all information dissemination. For completeness, we also present an algorithm called Path_Discovery that uses the sequence of invocations of ℓ-DTG to solve all-to-all information dissemination, when the graph diameter is unknown. This algorithm is similar in flavour to that of the General_EID algorithm described in Section 5.3 and also makes use of the Termination_Check algorithm, albeit with a different broadcasting technique (calling $T(k)$ rather than RR Broadcast).

Lemma 26. *Path_Discovery algorithm takes $O(D \log^2 n \log D)$ time to solve all-to-all information dissemination.*

```
Path_Discovery (k)
1: k=1
2: repeat
3:     execute sequence T(k)
4:     call algorithm Termination_Check (k)
5:     if node_status = "failed" then
6:         k = 2k
7:         set node_status to "default"
8:     else terminate
```

Algorithm 6: Path_Discovery; code for vertex v.

Applying techniques similar to section 5.3, the complexity can be easily shown for the case with unknown diameter as well.

References

[1] K. Censor-Hillel, B. Haeupler, J. Kelner, and P. Maymounkov, "Global computation in a poorly connected world: Fast rumor spreading with no dependence on conductance," in *Proceedings of the Forty-fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '12. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2012, pp. 961–970.

[2] F. Chierichetti, S. Lattanzi, and A. Panconesi, "Rumour spreading and graph conductance," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, ser. SODA '10. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010, pp. 1657–1663.

[3] B. Haeupler, "Simple, fast and deterministic gossip and rumor spreading," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, ser. SODA '13. SIAM, 2013, pp. 705–716.

[4] K. Censor-Hillel and H. Shachnai, "Fast information spreading in graphs with large weak conductance," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, ser. SODA '11. SIAM, 2011, pp. 440–448.

[5] C. C. Newport, "Radio network lower bounds made easy," in *Distributed Computing - 28th International Symposium, DISC 2014, Austin, TX, USA, October 12-15, 2014. Proceedings*, 2014, pp. 258–272.

[6] R. Karp, C. Schindelhauer, S. Shenker, and B. Vocking, "Randomized rumor spreading," in *Foundations of Computer Science, 2000. Proceedings. 41st Annual Symposium on*, 2000, pp. 565–574.

[7] S. Baswana and S. Sen, "A simple and linear time randomized algorithm for computing sparse spanners in weighted graphs," *Random Structures and Algorithms*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 532–563, 2007. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rsa.20130

[8] A. Demers, D. Greene, C. Hauser, W. Irish, J. Larson, S. Shenker, H. Sturgis, D. Swinehart, and D. Terry, "Epidemic algorithms for replicated database maintenance," in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, ser. PODC '87. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1987, pp. 1–12.

[9] U. Feige, D. Peleg, P. Raghavan, and E. Upfal, "Randomized broadcast in networks," in *Algorithms*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, T. Asano, T. Ibaraki, H. Imai, and T. Nishizeki, Eds. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990, vol. 450, pp. 128–137.

[10] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and A. Demers, "Spatial gossip and resource location protocols," in *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '01. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2001, pp. 163–172.

[11] G. Giakkoupis, "Tight bounds for rumor spreading in graphs of a given conductance," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, Mar. 10–12 2011, pp. 57–68.

[12] P. Fraigniaud and G. Giakkoupis, "On the bit communication complexity of randomized rumor spreading," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual ACM Symposium on Parallelism in*

Algorithms and Architectures, ser. SPAA '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 134–143. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1810479.1810505

[13] D. Mosk-Aoyama and D. Shah, "Computing separable functions via gossip," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, ser. PODC '06. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2006, pp. 113–122.

[14] F. Chierichetti, S. Lattanzi, and A. Panconesi, "Almost tight bounds for rumour spreading with conductance," in *Proceedings of the Forty-second ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 399–408.

[15] B. Doerr, M. Fouz, and T. Friedrich, "Social networks spread rumors in sublogarithmic time," in *Proceedings of the Forty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '11. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2011, pp. 21–30. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1993636.1993640

[16] ——, "Why rumors spread so quickly in social networks," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 70–75, Jun. 2012. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2184319.2184338

[17] B. Haeupler and D. Malkhi, "Optimal gossip with direct addressing," in *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, ser. PODC '14. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014, pp. 176–185. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org.libproxy1.nus.edu.sg/10.1145/2611462.2611489

[18] M. Bradonjić, R. Elsässer, T. Friedrich, T. Sauerwald, and A. Stauffer, "Efficient broadcast on random geometric graphs," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, ser. SODA '10. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010, pp. 1412–1421.

[19] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah, "Randomized gossip algorithms," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 14, no. SI, pp. 2508–2530, Jun. 2006.

[20] A. Sarwate and A. Dimakis, "The impact of mobility on gossip algorithms," in *INFOCOM 2009, IEEE*, April 2009, pp. 2088–2096.

[21] R. Gandhi, A. Mishra, and S. Parthasarathy, "Minimizing broadcast latency and redundancy in ad hoc networks," *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 840–851, Aug 2008.

[22] C. Georgiou, S. Gilbert, R. Guerraoui, and D. R. Kowalski, "On the complexity of asynchronous gossip," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-seventh ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*, ser. PODC '08. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2008, pp. 135–144.

[23] M. Jerrum and A. Sinclair, "Conductance and the rapid mixing property for markov chains: The approximation of permanent resolved," in *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, ser. STOC '88. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1988, pp. 235–244. [Online]. Available: http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/62212.62234

[24] S. Daum, F. Kuhn, and Y. Maus, "Rumor spreading with bounded in-degree," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1506.00828, 2015.

[25] S. P. Vadhan, "Pseudorandomness," *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science: Vol. 7: No. 1-3, pp 1-336.*, vol. 7, no. 1-3, pp. 1–336, 2012.

[26] J. Augustine, G. Pandurangan, P. Robinson, S. T. Roche, and E. Upfal, "Enabling robust and efficient distributed computation in dynamic peer-to-peer networks," in *IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2015, Berkeley, CA, USA, 17-20 October, 2015*, 2015, pp. 350–369. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2015.29